

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The present response is submitted to place the above-identified application in condition for allowance based on the indication of allowable subject matter in the outstanding Office Action.

More particularly, in the outstanding Office Action Claims 26, 34-44, 48, and 49 were allowed. Claims 45 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 3,806,583 to Dewell. Claims 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dewell.

In response to the outstanding Office Action, and to promote prosecution, the present response cancels without prejudice Claims 45-49. Thus, only allowed Claims 26 and 34-44 are currently pending in this application. Certain claims are amended to correct minor informalities.

Applicants also, however, provide the following comments on the reasons for allowance of Claim 39. In the outstanding Office Action it is noted that Claims 39-49 were not rejected "...in the manner that the claim 39 requires the 'trap mechanism' to condense and solidify the impurities".<sup>1</sup> In response to the above-noted statement it is noted that Claim 39 does not require that the impurities be solidified. With respect to Claim 39, it does not matter whether the condensed impurity is a solid or a liquid. Thus, the above-noted statement for reasons for allowance is believed to not be commensurate in scope with Claim 39.

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of September 2, 2003, page 5, lines 9-11.